

SUBJECT: PIDOKHA Olexander Mykolaevitch

DATE : 28 Mar 1963

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NATIONAL CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. Subject arrived in Canada in November 1963 under some UNESCO scheme. During his sojourn he concentrated himself on getting in contact with some prominent representatives of various noncommunist Ukrainian activities in Canada, such as scholars, press-people, and politicians.

His exploration of particular fields Subject started from Universities with professors and lecturers of Ukrainian descent, to which he had a direct access due to his affiliation (officially at least) with UNESCO.

Subject did quite a lot of travelling all over the country and among others visited TORONTO, OTTAWA, and WINNIPEG. He stayed mostly in hotels preferably those run by YMCA. He did not shun visiting private houses, having talks without witnesses, going to restaurants and being entertained; borrowed various anti-communist books and papers which he usually returned after reading, behaved freely. The only thing he asked to avoid was eventual press-publicity. The way he operated would indicate that Subject's main target was a study of personalities he was interested in. For contacting the people concerned he also used local "progressives" (Canadian communists of Ukrainian descent) who very often organized for him meetings, addresses, and basic information.

2. Biographic data: apparent age 40-43, Ukrainian, married, his wife is a physician (medical), they have two children - boy and girl - both interested in collecting stamps. Subject's father was a blacksmith. He died when Subject was one year old. During WW II subject served with the Army as editor of a front-paper. His wife also served with the Army. Subject claims to be a poet and former contributor to, or editor of "DNIPRO" magazine.

3. Subject planned to visit the US states but was not sure whether he will receive a visa. He wants to see England on his way to France from where he is supposed to leave for the Soviet Union on 1 June 1963.

4. Subject seems to be of average intelligence, rather reserved, cautious, genuinely interested in poetry. His Ukrainian is pretty fine with some Russicism which he explained by the fact that during the WW II the Soviet Army had had a Russifying influence on him.

5. At a private meeting with a group of local prominents in WINNIPEG on 8 Feb 1963, organized by Mrs SEMENIV, fnu, director of communist bookshop, Subject was very aggressive, defended fully the Soviet system, criticized activities of Ukrainian emigration. Among other things he stated that:

28 March 1963

a/ "The 22nd Congress of the CPSU stressed explicitly further development of national, non-Russian cultures and if there ever will be one single world language then perhaps in a thousand years but not sooner. Nobody takes it seriously in the Ukraine.

b/ Ukrainian emigration is reactionary, lost her touch with reality in the Ukraine and does not go "beyond Shevchenko, Franko, and Vinnichenko". Pressed on lack of Ukrainian schools in Kuban and Crimea he became very aggressive and claimed that emigres did not know whether Ukrainians there wanted Ukrainian schools.

c/ Nobody in KIEV is going to exert any pressure on young Ukrainian poets and writers like VIHGRANOVSKYI, DRACH and others. They are great talents and TYCHYNA is also a great poet, he is a giant in literature. It was right TYCHYNA had written peans for Stalin otherwise he were dead to-day.

d/ Instead of criticizing, the emigrants should visit the Ukraine and see themselves great achievements and progress the Soviet system had made. "We acknowledge our shortages openly in the press nowadays and we are not ashamed of them".

6. Various opinions expressed by Subject at different meetings with our Sources:

a/ In a tete-a-tete talk Subject rejected any idea of eventual return of Stalinism. He described it as simply impossible. When writing about Stalinist terror the Ukrainian emigration should also write about sacrifices of other nationalities, such as Byelorussians, Georgians, and Russians themselves. Russification is much exaggerated abroad. In reality, the Russifying impact is much smaller. As an example he pointed the Army whose Russifying influence had much diminished owing to the fact that nowadays the Ukrainian youth became nationally conscious.

b/ The school-reform of 1958/59 according to which parents are supposed to decide to what school their children will have to go, has been misinterpreted abroad since it does refer to Russians, and not Ukrainians "who send their kids to Ukrainian schools anyway".

c/ Eventual giving away of West Ukraine to Poland Subject described as ridiculous and impossible.

d/ Agreed that Ukrainian scientists going abroad should stress more their nationality. On this occasion complained that Canada was very reluctant to grant visas to Soviet Ukrainian.

e/ Subject was very intensively interested in some ideas on eventual partnership of Ukrainian communists and their Russian counterparts in Moscow but did not comment.

f/ Admitted that he was not familiar with working class problems in the Soviet Union.

f/ When asked whether he thought the same way about Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalists" as they were writing about them in KIEV, answered that one should direct this question to respective authors but not to him as he himself never wrote such things.

g/ Cultural exchange Subject considered to be very positive. When countered with the argument that Soviet Ukrainian visitors to Canada were being isolated from Ukrainian community and restricted in their movements in general, replied that by now he had many addresses and knew whom they should visit in the future.

7. In his private, mainly tete-a-tete talks, Subject did not usually argue too much in defense of the Soviet system, from time to time was willing even to admit one of the other shortcomings, and in general stuck to the line of an opportunistic Ukrainian communist with his rather articulated regional patriotism.

8. Subject had 5 or 6 meetings and discussions with Professor who also supplied Subject with some books, among them: "Vertep" by Lubchenko, "Holubi Dylizhansy" and others. Two books Subject took for himself from the University-Library. Professor characterized Subject as of average intelligence, party-man but with territorial Ukrainian patriotism, and a weak poet.

9. Subject paid two visits to I's (our representative's) house. During the first one Subject was given several books which were supplemented at the second (in presence of Professor) with following ones:

- "Poetry" by Malaniuk,
- Monography of Arkhipenko
- Poetry by P. Filipowitch
- "Up to the Summits" by Harasevich
- "Life" by Tarnovskiy
- "Duke's Emal" by Laturynska
- "New Poetry" # 1
- "New Poetry" # 2
- "New Poetry" # 3
- "Single Tree" by Tarnavskiy
- "Poems" by Karpenko-Karyi
- "Tigers" by E. Andiivska
- "Dalapita" by E. Andiivska
- "Bridges" by Tarnavsky
- "New Poetry" # 4

plus additional publications of "Prolog".  
Iva. lives in TORONTO.

10. In TORONTO Subject also had a discussion with Ukrainian writers (among them with U. SAMCHUK) in Professor's cabinet at the University. This was arranged by Professor himself. Separately, Subject had also meetings with Petro VOLYNIAK, editor of "Novi Dni" in Toronto who published in that paper (issue # 158, March 1963) Subject's poem "Thought" (Dumka).

11. In TORONTO Subject was also asking about Yuri LAVRINENKO and his former colleague Oleksa VERETNICHENKO (the latter lives now in Detroit &, also writes poems) - who he wanted to meet.

12. In Montreal, Canada ,on 17 March 1963 Subject had a talk with VESOLOVSKY -employee of the CBC at his office. From there Subject went directly to OTTAWA.

13. In WINNIPEG Subject met many people privately among them Prof. RUDNYTSKY. In OTTAWA Subject met Prof.BIDA.